

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action of January 25, 2010, claims 1, 5-14, 16, 18 and 20 were rejected. Additionally, claims 4, 15, 17 and 19 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8-10, canceled claims 4, 15-17 and 19 and added new claims 21-26. Additionally, Applicants have filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Furthermore, Applicants have filed herewith an information disclosure statement (IDS) for Shimanuki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,307,440), Chen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,875), Ma et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0142512), Akira et al. (JP 08-046424A) and Hung et al. ("A Packaged 1.1-GHz CMOS VCO with Phase Noise of -126 dBc/Hz at a 600-kHz Offset," IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits, January 2000, pages 100-103, volume 35). Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments, the new claims, the RCE, the IDS and the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determination that claims 4, 15, 17, and 19 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Final Office Action states that claims 4, 15, 17, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have rewritten claims 4, 17 and 19 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claim 4, amended claim 9 to include all of the limitations of claim 17, and amended claim 10 to include all of the limitations of claim 19. As a result, claims 4, 17 and 19 have been canceled. As amended, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9 and 10 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 5-14, 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Knutson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,035,695, hereinafter “Knutson”) in view of Takahira (U.S. Pat. No. 5,424,527). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not obvious over Knutson in view of Takahira for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

As described above, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable.

Dependent Claims 5-7 and 11-14

Claims 5-7 and 11-14 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 and 11-14 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of original claim 1 and one of the limitations of original claim 4. Support for the amendments to claim 8 is found in the present Application at, for example, original claims 1-4.

Amended claim 8 recites in part “*a mutual inductance of the printed coil and the non-printed coil increases with a length of the non-printed coil until a maximum overlapping area between the printed coil and the non-printed coil has been reached,*” which is similar to the limitation “*the mutual inductance increases with the length of the air coil until a maximum overlapping area between the printed coil and the air coil has been reached,*” which has been indicated in the Office Action as being allowable subject matter. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 8 is now in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 9

As described above, claim 9 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 9 is allowable.

Dependent Claim 18

Claim 18 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 18 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 9.

Independent Claim 10

As described above, claim 10 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 10 is allowable.

Dependent Claim 20

Claim 20 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 10. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 20 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

New Claims 21-26

New claims 21-26 have been added. Support for new claims 21-26 is found in the present Application at, for example, original claims 2-7. Claims 21-26 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 21-26 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 8.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments, the new claims, the RCE, the IDS and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Lim et al.

Date: March 24, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham

PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road

San Jose, CA 95132

Phone: (925) 249-1300

Fax: (925) 249-0111